

MAN!

"Man is the measure-
ment of everything."

If There Is Anything That Cannot Bear Free Thought—Let It Crack—WE NDELL PHILLIPS

Vol. 6—No. 8 Administration and Editorial Address
P. O. Box 971, Los Angeles, Calif.

Los Angeles, Calif., August, 1938

1 (425)

Single Copies FIVE CENTS

CAPITALISM'S CHALLENGE IN SPAIN'S STRUGGLE

Two Years of Mass Murder in Spain

The curtain has just rung down on a two year carnage that a so-called civil war, instigated by a band of gangster militarists, brought upon the people of the Spanish peninsula.

Two years of the greatest tragedy—a tragedy that cannot be equalled to any of history's catastrophes from which the human race was made to suffer. In the two years of mass murder that has fallen on the workers and peasants of Spain, over a million dead cover the hills and valleys of that stricken land; a million more have been maimed and crippled; the whole country is laid to waste, and those that escaped death and injury are suffering want and starvation.

A people is doomed to perish—that is the will of a reactionary band of mass murderers.

To the world's rulers, the tragedy in Spain is only a dress rehearsal for a gala performance that is bound to be staged on the political arena sooner or later. Italy, Germany, Russia, England and France—all are feverishly preparing for the Big Show. The statesmen of those countries know right well that they will soon be embroiled in another big-scale struggle for supremacy of power and are meanwhile testing the efficacy of their murder weapons on the suffering people of Spain.

So far Italy and Germany had the upper hand in the tragic two years for the Spanish people. Their murderous tanks, cannon and aircraft have wreaked havoc on that suffering people. Hitler and Mussolini have poured in their best weapons as well as their most trained divisions, and are determined to crush the Spanish republic at any cost. France and Russia have spared some of their ammunition, but at a very moderate pace. America has invoked the neutrality act, contenting herself with shipping her arms and ammunition via the Hitler-Mussolini route.

British Imperialism's Role—True to Form

A strange role is being played by England. True to tradition, she is playing her diplomatic game in the Spanish conflict with the same shrewdness that she has been playing in every other political situation. In the actual conflict she is taking no sides, openly at least, with either of the belligerents. Politically, however, the Chamberlain government is very much desirous of a Franco victory. This is borne out by the conciliatory tone Chamberlain displays to the Franco regime every time he sinks a British vessel, and by the "peace pact" he concluded with Mussolini, practically conceding a Franco victory as one of its paramount terms. He even went so far in his favors to Franco as to persuade Monsieur Daladier to close the Pyrenean border so as to prevent the little help that has been seeping through for Loyalist Spain.

England, we should remember, has for centuries been dominating the political arena. Her naval strength, which up to recent events was able to rule almost all the seas, became the most dominant factor in swaying political situations one way or another. Yet, something very peculiar happened to the great Sea Lion in the Spanish conflict: Mussolini is gradually maneuvering to undermine British control in the Mediterranean, threatening to impair a direct contact with her colonial possessions—something no power, however strong on land and sea, ever dared—but Chamberlain looks on with utter indifference, and even pleads with Il Duce to maintain friendly relations with His Majesty's government. Why? What has happened to the ferocious Lion that so meekly permits a comparatively weaker power to twist his tail?

When Fascism Began Its Triumphs

In order to understand England's part in the Spanish situation, we must look back to the self-preserving role she has played in social and political events of recent years. When, in 1920, the Italian workers had seized and occupied many steel works and other metal shops, the oncoming social revolution not only spelled fear among Italian capitalists but also created a state of uneasiness in the capitalist class throughout the world, notably among English lords. And when Mussolini appeared with his fascist theory of totalitarian control over industry and labor, Italian property owners welcomed it with open arms. The terrorism that followed under this new regime is reminiscent of the darkest periods in human history, but Great Britain, and all the great powers that had just quit fighting for "peace and democracy" were unconcerned about the fate of the thousands of free-thinking people that were clubbed and waylaid by fascisti bands. English Toryism, in fact, welcomed this banditism as did Italian capitalism; for, whatever we may think of Fascism, it served its purpose in preventing the spread of communism—something the English Lords feared most.

Nazism Mounts the Scene
A similar condition asserted itself in Germany. During the tragic years when the people were suffering under the yoke of the Versailles treaty, the industrial magnates in Germany feared a revolt by the German masses was inevitable. They felt the Republic was then in no position to suppress a rebellious outbreak as it did in the days of Noske . . . English and French capitalism had their "noose" tightened more and more around the starving populace, and, at the same time, French troops, with Britain's approval, were massed on the Rhine; for fear of a German declaration of war? No. Germany was then totally unarmed to undertake such a venture. The troops were there for the purpose of crushing any intimation of a revolt from the left, or at least to prevent its spreading beyond German territory. And so it happened that when Hitler came with his Nazi-fascist declaration of a new Reich, German, French and English capitalists felt themselves relieved of the growing danger that threatened their shaky institutions. They actually catered to Hitler from the day he ascended the throne. When he began to arm his nation and later felt secure enough to reoccupy the Rhine, England looked away, and France either was caught napping or else she took the hint from England not to interfere in his plans for a strong Germany.

England's reaction towards Hitler's annexation of Austria is, also, an appreciation for the iron rule which he has established over the German masses. So is Chamberlain's intended sacrifice of Czechoslovakia a gift which England wants to present to Hitler.

All in all it is England's policy to strengthen the reactionary forces so they could serve as a bulwark against possible threats from the left wing.

Capitalism Fears Anarchist Triumph in Spain
Coming back to the tragic days of Spain, we see English Toryism in its true light. English capitalists, controlling the greatest monopolies of the Spanish land resources, were placed in a delicate position. On the one hand they viewed with alarm at Hitler's and Mussolini's interest in the natural resources of Spain and their determination to help Franco conquer it for them; on the other, they were suspiciously uneasy about the policy of a leftist government, if successful in coming out victorious, would pursue towards foreign investment. It was a case of the devil and the deep blue sea.

Moreover, a republican social order in Spain, especially such as is already organized and maintained by the C.N.T. and F.A.I. in Catalonia, is entirely different in ideology from the social orders that threatened to overtake Italy and Germany. The workers' syndicates in Catalonia have proven to the world as the only sane method by which the workers and peasants could derive full benefit from their labors. This Anarchist ideal of communal life presaged a bad omen for international bankerism. They looked with profound alarm at the syndicate movement initiated by the C.N.T. and F.A.I., which, if successful, might lead to a social revolution in the outside world, and thus not only abrogate their firm hold on the economic life in Spain but might even threaten to bring about a collapse of the whole capitalist system.

Capitalism Prefers Fascism as

Against Social Revolution

And so international capitalism, led by the clever politicians of England, gathered at the diplomatic tables and decided it would be better strategy to side with the Hitler-Mussolini combination for a Franco victory in Spain. They know right well that fascism and capitalism will always strive to protect each other against the common enemy—the social revolution. We see today that England and Italy have already come to terms and will soon affix their signatures to a friendly peace treaty. France is somewhat vacillating just now, but eventually she will follow her English ally and come into the fold. Hitler's plenipotentiaries are now in secret negotiation for some such peace treaty, and we may rest assured that after a little bargaining with the representatives of capitalism, Chamberlain will see to it that a deal is closed. Even the Soviet diplomats suddenly became as silent as an Egyptian mummy . . .

This combination of fascism-capitalism is actually murdering our Spanish comrades. Each one is trying out its machinery for a war that must come whenever economic competition becomes too strained among the various factions of ruling capitalism; but meanwhile they are united in a common cause to crush the movement for a new socialization that is taking root in Spain. It is a class struggle pure and simple; and unless the international proletariat comes to the aid of our Spanish workers and peasants the hope for a better world in which to live will be buried for a long time to come.

Samuel Polinow

How Can The Class Struggle Be Ended?

With the enactment of the National Labor (Wagner) bill as the law of the land, the high riding labor leadership has tried to make their followers believe that the class struggle in America is ended and that the millennium was just around the corner, and jubilations ensued, accompanied by hymns of praise bestowed upon the achievements of the Lewises and Greens, via Mr. Roosevelt's "new deal" administration.

The exploiters of human labor knew different. Disregard for every "right" that the Wagner act prescribed became with them the common method of sabotage. They decided to contest every inch of the act via the Courts most of whose judges owe their rise to power to their financial backing.

Not relying on the courts' aid alone, the employing class have loosened a reign of terror upon striking workers. The local police, deputized sheriffs, national guards and the local courts, plus hired thugs, constitute the whole machinery of violence and jail—that are today being utilized in the drive against labor.

The Class Struggle is On

The reign of terror is not limited to any particular area. From coast to coast come stories of brutality, bloodshed and wholesale jailings of workers.

In Westwood, California, the Red River Lumber Co. organized a vigilante-police mob that drove one thousand workers from their homes, shot one and beat thirty.

In New York City, the police of the "liberal" Mayor La Guardia are enforcing the infamous anti-picketing injunction of the American Labor Party Judge Cotillo.

In San Antonio, Texas, the local government is engaged in a brutal drive against workers attempting to organize themselves.

In North Chicago, 250 policemen carried out a brutal attack upon strikers picketing the Chicago Hardware Foundry. Tear-gas bombs were fired upon men, women and children, causing dozens of casualties. Police jailed

scores of strikers afterwards, charging the latter with inciting to riot.

In New Orleans, Louisiana, police jailed at one time 400 striking truck and taxi drivers. Leaders of the strike were beaten in the local jail. The drayage firms and the cab company admitted having paid out to the police \$12,000 for "strike duty".

In Detroit, Michigan, 50 strikers at the American Brass Works were injured from gassings and beatings.

Police fired upon strikers at the Rubber Works in Akron, Ohio. In Steubenville, Ohio, 200 thugs of the Weirton Steel Works forced members of the National Labor Relations Board to flee in the middle of the night.

In Newton, Iowa, the Governor ordered out the National Guards to strike "duty" at the Maytag Washing Machine Company. At first, when the Governor ordered the factory closed, the strike leaders were jubilant. Subsequently, the Governor used the same National Guards to protect the scabs, as he approved the re-opening of the plant.

Such, in brief, is but a summary of the class struggle that is being waged in the United States today—the National Labor Act notwithstanding.

The Lessons of the Class Struggle

The lesson that the workers ought to draw from this state of class struggle is a manifold one: Neither the A.F. of L or the C.I.O. can bring to them the millennium. Not even with the aid of the entire machinery of the federal government, as in the present instance.

Both labor organizations are but in their essence, bargaining organizations with the exploiters of human labor. President Roosevelt's "new deal" programme does not claim more than the striving to maintain the *status quo* of the wage system. The employing class knows and understands all this only too well. Well enough, to pretend to deal with labor's paid leaders when forced to do so, and to knife labor in the back by whatever method it can employ via the money bag of

IBERIAN ANARCHIST FEDERATION'S NEW STAND

One year ago, in July 1937, the Iberian Anarchist Federation (F.A.I.) held a conference at Valencia, where it decided its new theoretical and practical basis. As the F.A.I. is today undoubtedly that organization of anarchism which is numerically the strongest and of importance the greatest within the International of Anarchism, it is absolutely necessary for all its other sections to deal with this new theoretical elaboration of our principles. There is no doubt that it will exercise a profound influence upon our whole international movement and therefore it is incumbent for each anarchist to take a positive standpoint towards this peculiar new platform of our principles and methods.

No New Orientation

It is very striking that the F.A.I. has seen fit to call this conference for the purpose of drafting a new platform just two months after the outrageous, treacherous and homicidal days on the part of the Spanish government of Barcelona-Valencia, with the connivance of all the bourgeois and socialist parties, led by the pseudo-communistic party of the Third International, against the F.A.I., in May, 1937. One ought to have expected that the F.A.I. would, after that event, once for all recognize its horrible error of credulity, in assuming that a social revolution, in favour of anarchism, can be carried through in a combination with that maze of political molluscs within dishonesty and hypocrisy, called "anti-fascism", this being a motley set of authoritarian parties, only rivalling with fascism in the struggle for power.

I, for one, would have thought that after the assassination of so many comrades, in the name of anti-fascism, and after the absolutely useless sacrifice of so many thousands of others in a war which only offers the alternative of a Right or Left fascism—I should have expected that the F.A.I. would have acknowledged its terrible mistake, and give anarchism what is due to it: its true voice, and that it will emphasize its real meaning and conception.

Unfortunately this is not the case.

No Definition of the Principal Aim

Fundamentally, it is very characteristic that the whole treatise ("dictaman") does not contain one syllable of a real definition of the aim and object of anarchism. There is no clear-cut explanation of that what anarchism means (the negation and abolition of government) and, of course, there is nothing of that in the platform what anarchism must demand from those who struggle for its realization (no voluntary support of government in any way).

Most likely all this was omitted intentionally. Because the whole platform is supposed to be something which is to suit the F.A.I. "for all exigencies". JUST for these, it is stated, the theoretical and practical principles of the F.A.I., as hitherto pursued, were allegedly "no more adequate"; and therefore the ensuing new ones had to be devised.

Let us understand it clearly: 1). The platform does not offer any clear definition of anarchism. 2). It is to serve for "exigencies", as they come and will come in the course of time.

In these two points I recognize a positive element of opportunism and most dangerous possibilities and unhappy surprises for real anarchism, which show themselves already in the terrible present, but attempt to give vent also for the future. If the platform would contain a clear definition of anarchism and its logical methods, I am sure that then every anarchist could also know how to apply them to any "exigencies", and would also know when the former became violated. As it stands now, the conscious omission of any fundamental definition of anarchism, and its methods, is an intention to give free vogue for opportunism. It means that one may henceforth apply oneself to and of all "exigencies", without being obliged to any obligatory principle, which one already beforehand did not enunciate at all.

accumulated stolen wealth, produced by the toilers of the land.

The employers understand then the class struggle far better than does the working class.

For, if the working class would understand the true significance of the class struggle, they would not rely on and entrust their fate into the hands of any compromise-barter organizations as the A. F. of L. or C. I. O., nor trust for a single moment that any governmental agency will prove of aid in bringing to them the fruits of their own labor.

Exploitation of human labor, oppression of striking workers by violence, terrorism and jail cannot be brought to an end by compromising trade union leaders or "liberal" governmental politicians.

Who Can End the Class Struggle?

Only we, the exploited ourselves, can terminate once and for all time the mountain of evil that the class struggle brings upon us today. But this end cannot be brought about by any existing labor organizations, political parties or strikes for shorter hours and more pay, but by RISING IN A SOCIAL REVOLUTION FOR the avowed purpose of ushering in the true millennium that is the only one worth fighting for: A NEW SOCIETY, FREED OF EXPLOITERS AND RULERS, THE ANARCHIST SOCIETY.

The appearance of quite a number of apologetic articles in some anarchist publications, written mostly by anarcho-syndicalists, and attempting to justify the compromise road upon which the Iberian Anarchist Federation (F.A.I.) of Spain is pursuing, as well as the sneering and slandering attacks that Leon Trotsky and his followers are giving vent to in speaking of the role of the anarchists in Spain,—both factors make the study of Comrade Pierre Ramus most timely and important.—EDITOR.

of a free human individuality to the always fictitious abstraction of a "whole".

Anarchism wishes to unfetter man from discipline, not submit him to it. The social revolution, inspired by anarchism, is not "directed" by anybody, but has to be the enlightened initiative of those masses of the people which do no more recognize the yoke of authority and monopoly. Such mass-action brings about by necessity free coordination of action, which makes all "direction" demanded by all political parties, mainly by bolshheviks and fascists, superfluous.

Directing always needs authority, in order to be obeyed. Of course, a social revolution can mainly be carried through only by the workers and their organizations. But none of them should have the revolution as such "in their hands", because this would be equivalent to a dictatorship to bring it about. An anarchist social revolution has nothing else to do than to destroy the impediments to the workers' emancipation and offer to society the example of its reorganization upon the basis of liberty. It frees society from every thralldom, but does not subdue it to any sort of *workers' rule*. The latter must always be, as facts prove this already by bolshhevism or fascism clearly enough, worse than any bourgeois rule; the worker, becoming a master, a governor, a ruler, is historically less dominated by a certain self-limitation.

No Real Fundamentals Offered

Under "fundamentals" there is consciously avoided to point at what *lays in the way*, impeding a "free society", from the anarchist standpoint. There is no movement, least of all the fascist one, which should proclaim a free society as its aim. But anarchism alone is showing that only by the absolute dissolution of government can a free society organically develop.

The platform of the F.A.I. does not even mention this fundamental principle with one word. Probably because it would then have to show the *means* whereby to bring this about. To these means positively do not belong war and the collaboration with government, or with political parties!

The crux of the whole platform, its real, *hidden*, purpose is to be seen in the "Declaration about the moment".

Therein it is claimed, that because anarchism has to influence thoroughly and throughout the Spanish proletariat—I wish, it would!—therefore the F.A.I. must . . . without stopping to heed and to recognize as of the highest importance the necessities of the war, without renouncing its final aim, it must pronounce itself, for giving an impulse to the revolution, in favour of all popular organisms, by the means of them, in which the action of the F.A.I. can be efficacious, in affirming a progressive sentiment and thereby bring eventually about the culmination of the, to be realized revolution.

In these, seemingly altogether very harmless, but ambiguous words, there is in reality expressed that what has caused the bankruptcy of social democracy; in fact, it contains a reiteration of its history, this time, horribly enough, repeated by anarchists . . . Social democracy started with a "maximum" and a "minimum" programme, and it ended in the mire of non-socialist, "popular front" platforms. By working for a "minimum" where there could, allegedly, be promoted "general progress", i. e. in parliament and in similar political positions, representative positions, social democracy also promised to promote "the final aim".

So well was this done that the whole social-democratic movement of marxism became a pack of corrupted leaders, bribed by parliament and ministerial portfolios, and the rank and file huge multitude of organized ignorance, led by the leaders into perdition, blindly following as voting-cattle, unable to struggle for its own emancipation. Fascism only killed outright what was dead already long ago as a socialist movement.

The above words of the platform of the F.A.I. constitute a slyly couched repetition of the erroneous, treacherous policy of social-democracy during 70 years. They are to open the way for the F.A.I. to become a political party, instead of being an anti-political anarchist organization. That what Angelo Pestana, the Spanish syndicalist traitor, has perpetrated since 1931, and which culminated in the formation of a "political syndicalist party", participating by nomination and voting in the elections, supporting the republican governments—the very same possibilities are opened in the above, shrewdly construed sentences of the platform for the whole F.A.I.

A Wrong Interpretation

Under the title of "Anarchist interpretation of the Spanish revolution", the platform leaves totally out of sight that collectivism is upholding the wage system, which means that collectivism is only a higher form of capitalism, but no approach to a commonwealth wherein the wage system is abolished.

Instead of proclaiming itself for such a society—alone abolishing governmentalism and all bureaucracy—the platform does not even mention such an aim. At the same time it states:

Those of us who until yesterday were combatting without a truce the inhuman expression of a state of injustice and tyranny, in the new state of things we meet our comrades at the side of the new institutions, spring up during the revolution, as the expression of the most profound wishes of the multitudes. We set up before us the total disappearance of the bourgeois remnants which still subsist, and we have to invigorate all organisms which contribute to this finality. Just the same do we consider, in view of our prohibitive position of the past, that it is now the duty of all anarchists, to intervene in as many public institutions which can serve to be pillars of, and give impulse to the new state of things.

Several years before the world-war Dr. Maryson, an

A Victorius War Conditional for Anarchism?

By what spirit the theoretical and practical ideas of the new platform are animated, shows itself, behind many glittering and equivocal words, already in the introduction, by this:

The F.A.I. cannot fulfill integrally its mission if the war is lost. To gain the war, this means to maintain, firmly and victoriously, the principle of the revolution, and this one will be the immediate consequence of victory.

Lo and behold! These words of the platform are written two months after the slaughtering of many of our best comrades, the succumbing of our movement to the Catalonian government, the Generalidad, in league with social democracy, bolshevism and national-republican-bourgeois elements; these words are written while the F.A.I. is bleeding from hundreds, nay, thousands of fraternal wounds, caused by the aforesaid.

Meanwhile, the F.A.I. had ample opportunity of learning what, for instance, its glorious victory of July 1936 actually meant for the social revolutionary principle of anarchism. Was it really a victory? this may be doubted since May 1937. Nevertheless, the F.A.I. makes, even after the worst experience to the contrary, the Spanish workers and peasants fatuously believe, that by sacrificing their lives for the benefit of the Spanish government (showing itself even before victory as the worst fascism against anarchism . . .) therefrom will follow their social emancipation.

One stands aghast. Thus far wrong and shallow notions of "anarcho-bolshevism" about a so-called "revolutionary warfare" can mislead even good and brave comrades. And this is proclaimed in a time when it is absolutely clear that a victory of the Negrin government cannot be anything else than a victory of Stalin—and his Tcheka . . . Long before the end of the war the F.A.I. has the most heart rending occasion to see what terrible "ed fascism" this means for all libertarian elements in Spain.

War Devours Revolution

Surely, the more workers die for a victory of the legal government of Spain, the less strength remains to them for fighting against a victorious Franco. Positive it is that this lacking strength on the part of the workers is in the interest of both "combatants", as well of Negrin as of Franco.

Instead of preparing for the eventuality of victory of either side, preserving the strength of the workers and peasants as much as possible for a real social revolution, the platform attempts to inspire the whole F.A.I. with the wildest Jacobine-patriotic sentiments to offer itself up to the Negrin government. And this, after all that happened and happens since May, 1937—still this spirit of "loyalty".

Thomas Buckle, in his great "History of English Civilization" states, in full justice, that the worst curse with which governments and the churches have burdened the Spanish people was to foster in them a deep-rooted spirit of loyalty. I should never have thought it possible that this would also apply to the Spanish anarchists. But the above quotation shows, unfortunately, something quite different . . .

Since when is anarchism and its realization dependent upon the victory or defeat of a government in war? Historically it is proven that the victory of a government makes it more despotic against its own people. Thus it follows that the people have to be taught by anarchists mainly how to combat a victorious government, whichever side may win, the latter being immaterial to the people and also to anarchism.

This has, to my anarchistic estimation, to be the standpoint of anarchists, even before experiencing the most horrible disillusion of the Spanish ones, which has cost the lives of so many of the best of our movement for no cause, worthy of them. Instead of this we witness and perceive in the platform of the F.A.I. the linking up of the fate of the suffering masses and anarchism with the fate of one or other governmental side, which both will and must always be against the true emancipation of the workers and society.

Ambiguity Veils Authority

On the one side the platform is against any "totalitarian", dictatorial revolution, but on the other side it instructs its adherents "to subordinate themselves, individually and collectively, to our supreme final aim, and therefore we must be coherent, disciplined and temeritous". Because "the revolution must be orientated and directed". For this purpose the revolution must be "in the hands of the workers and the organization which authentically represents them."

We have here a subtle summary of correct and wrong notions which are cleverly intermixed and which, if clearly separated, exclude each other. As such, the above will suit by far more any authoritarian party than an anarchist movement, resting fundamentally upon the liberty of the individual, rejecting all organized submission

THE MORAL VICTORY OF FREEDOM OF THOUGHT

FOR FREEDOM OF PRESS AND THOUGHT

On October 6th, 1937, Marcus Graham, Editor of the publication "MAN!", was illegally seized and jailed by government agents. His house keys were taken from him, and the office of "MAN!" was broken into without a search warrant. The files and property of the publication were seized by the authorities.

We, the undersigned members and friends of the Labor Youth League of Jamaica, New York, protest the arrest of Marcus Graham. We feel that the hounding and persecution of Graham is a threat against the liberties of all who uphold freedom of thought.

It is perfectly clear that the deportation proceedings against Graham have been instituted because the authorities find that his personal convictions and those of the journal he edits are not to their liking.

Therefore, we, as members of the labor movement, demand the dropping of the deportation proceedings and the cessation of the efforts to suppress the publication "MAN!".

C. N. Bennett, Nat. Albanese, B. Haugwitz, Anne Laurier, Helen Juroff, Sol Dollinger, Emanuel Dollinger, Richard Bennett, Anna Schultheiss, A. O. Goldsmith, Russell Snyder, Esther Freistadt, Ted Steger, Joseph McGivney, Rhoda Podnus, Steven Sembrich, Ludwig Glass, William Koehler, Louis Albanese, Edward Schultheiss.

Copy to:
Frances Perkins
Secretary of Labor
Washington, D. C.

Submitted by
C. N. Bennett
Trade Union Advisor
Labor Youth League

Sherwood Anderson

Answering yours of July 31. If the use of my name on your National Committee will be of any help, you have my permission to use it.

Witter Bynner

From all I know of your case, I am completely in sympathy with your protest against inconceivably unjust treatment accorded you in a country which should be fundamentally a home for just such free presentation of ideas as you have been trying to exert.

Due to personal troubles, the death of my mother, I cannot undertake definite activity to aid you, but I wish you to know of my sympathetic interest and gladly accord you use of my name in your behalf.

Waldo Frank

I'll gladly accept your invitation to become a member of your National Committee.

Ammon A. Henacy
Miss Frances Perkins,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D. C.
Dear Madam:

My maternal grandfather, of Quaker stock, was an abolitionist who was much interested in freedom. My paternal grandfather came over here from Ireland in 1848 and fought in the Civil War for the North. I have emphasized the principles of freedom from my childhood. I was therefore pleased to note that President Roosevelt has revived the old idea of freedom which our forefathers promulgated in that he has called upon political refugees fleeing from the tyranny of European despots to feel welcome in this country. It would therefore seem logical for your department to drop at once

old Russian pioneer of anarchism in the "Yiddish" tongue, attempted in New York (U.S.A.) to gain the movement to this standpoint; logically correct, he also voiced the necessity of participation in the elections, in order to have at least some spokesman in the representative bodies of government. Fortunately, the American movement in the Yiddish language rejected entirely his proposition. I perceive its recurrence in an even stronger measure in the above contentions of the revised platform of the F.A.I.

To say the least, its standpoint is identical with that what Lenin has prescribed to the bolshevists. The above words of the platform contain a lot of "anarcho-bolshevism", but no anarchism.

Are We Collectivists?

Historically, it is well known that the Spanish anarchist movement until the nineteenth century, was mainly, in its economical aspiration, collectivist. But after that it adopted through its own, spontaneous evolution, communism as the basis of anarchism, in its economic aspects.

Since the Russian bolshevik revolution, and since diverse after-war tendencies of capitalism, it appears clearly that the word "collectivism" is synonymous and tantamount with the upholding of a strongly centralized form of capitalist economy, lifting it up to that level which the trustsification of industry and agriculture affords and necessitates. The words of those of our theoretical propounders of anarchism, that either communism will be the basis of a new society, or collectivism can only be a new basis of some higher form of collectivist capitalism, become strikingly justified in the light of social evolution.

This is also proven by the fact that, while the bolshevist-marxians call themselves falsely "communists" and state that communism is their "final aim", they are incapable to introduce anything which would approach communism. All that they do is collectivistic,

The protests that the 19 year-old persecution of Marcus Graham has aroused among the thinking people of America bespeaks of our moral victory. The authorities have placed, by the persecution of Graham and of MAN!, freedom of thought on trial. It is their action that is being challenged and fought. Any ultimate "legal" victory depends then chiefly upon the extent that our Committee will be enabled to increase the nation-wide protests—directed at President Roosevelt and at Miss Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor.

No true liberty-loving man or woman and organization should remain indifferent in this struggle for the preservation of the freedom of thought.

The pamphlet embodying the salient legal phases outlined by the attorneys for Graham, a history of the four years persecution of MAN!, and the talk of Marcus Graham before being sentenced to six months imprisonment, will appear shortly. We hope to be able to send out copies of it to every well known author, editor and educator of the country. Your material support can help us to carry through this plan.

Forward all correspondence, funds and copies of protests that you sent to Washington and the press, to the:

MARCUS GRAHAM
FREEDOM OF THE PRESS COMMITTEE
P. O. Box 971, Los Angeles, Calif.

the deportation proceedings against radicals already in our midst.

I refer to the long continued prosecution of Marcus Graham, the editor of an anarchist paper, MAN!. Inasmuch as Mr. Graham would be jailed by Hitler, Mussolini or Stalin it would seem that he should be welcome here.

Such papers as the Chicago Tribune and the Saturday Evening Post number their readers by millions and constantly malign anything which the Roosevelt administration suggests. Surely if the government does not succumb to the influence of this propaganda read by multitudes, it ought to be able to continue to allow the feeble voice of one man who advocates an ideal which appeals to but a handful of people.

Prof. H. A. Overstreet

Hon. Frances Perkins
Secretary of Labor
Washington, D. C.
My dear Miss Perkins:

May I ask that you make a personal inquiry into the case of Marcus Graham of Los Angeles, editor of "MAN!", who has been for nineteen years under an order of deportation. As far as I can make out by a reading of the history of the case, Mr. Graham is a sincere idealist who has been unmercifully hounded by the officers of the law because he expresses himself in ways that apparently are not understood by these same officers of the law.

In a day when we are confronted by all kinds of genuine anti-social behavior, it seems a terrible pity that our government should persecute a man who by no wildest stretch of the imagination could be considered an enemy of our society.

I am so profoundly an admirer of your progressive spirit that I have the hope that an inquiry by you will put an end to what seems to me to be an utter disgrace to this country.

which leads them, nay, has led them, already entirely back to capitalism on a developed scale of state-capitalism.

Thus collectivism is as little a road towards anarchism, or anarchist-communism, as democracy is a way to anarchism. As collectivism, by way of its absolute centralization, still more by its upholding of the wage-system, is inconceivable without government and thereby leads to monopoly and capitalist competition between the collective entities, in short only to be a huge, monopolist-capital trustsification—just so does marxism or democracy never lead towards anarchism. Being incapable of outgrowing private or state-capitalism, it must over again lead to some sort of *ochlocracy*—the rule of the governmentally promoted and organized mob, which is either embodied in a brown or red bolshevism or its offspring: fascism.

Collectivism and Fascism

As a matter of fact, fascism now-a-days proclaims collectivism everywhere as its economic aim and basic principle.

We hear this voiced by the "corporative" state of Mussolini; in the "socialistically" organized German nation of Hitler; expressly stating that the individual has to be submerged in the collectivity, the people, the nation. France, too, has declared that she wants a "syndicalistically" based state, which is a circumvented way of meaning a collectivist organized economy.

What democracy claims as a social right: the rule of the majority over the minority and the individual, this very same fascism claims in a different aspect: the rule of the collectivity, as represented by the absolute state, over the powerless individual, which is also entirely disregarded by democracy. Both are thereby, in reality proclaiming the enslavement of the multitude, the collectivity, the nation, the people, the whole of society—each dictator thereby only excluding his "individuality" from the submission to the whole. Just thereby is proven the contention of anarchism to be true: the

Norman Thomas

I'll be glad to serve on your National Committee. I have mentioned your case in the Call. Will also seek cooperation by Workers Defense League.

* * *

Revolutionary Youth Federation
(London, England)
Dear Comrades,

We are in receipt of your letter with the speech of comrade Graham, and we shall publicise the case in our next publication and subsequently; we should be obliged if you would send us details of the charges, trial, etc., (in clippings if possible).

Please convey our solidarity to Comrade Graham on the eve of Labour Day and inform him that the persecution of himself and of MAN! will not be ignored in the declaration of the R. Y. F. through its representative on the anarchist platform in London tomorrow.

* * *

Art Young

Just out of hospital, and your letter on hand. Needless to say I am for your vindication and freedom.

I shall do what I can to that end.

* * *

MARCUS GRAHAM DEFENSE COMMITTEE IN PHILA. BECOMES ACTIVE

The picnic that was arranged by the Marcus Graham Defense Committee at Comrade Weinberg's farm in Willow Grove, Sunday, July 17, was very successful. Comrades and sympathizers of our movement came out to enjoy the day in a pleasant atmosphere and at the same time help the committee in her work she undertook towards the defense of Marcus Graham.

After the first part of the Day was completed by enjoying a well-prepared proletarian meal, we took up the second part, consisting of short talks by Comrades Weinberg, B., and Samuel Polinow. Comrade Weinberg, said in part:

"An ideal is then an ideal when it brings out heroes and martyrs. Marcus Graham, like our Chicago martyrs, is a product of our ideal. That explains his stormy defiance to all the persecutions he was forced to undergo in the past 19 years."

Comrade B. gave a thorough description of Marcus Graham's case and told the gathering about the endless perseusion that followed him in the past two decades; he also gave a vivid description about his activities in the movement for freedom to which Marcus devoted the whole of his life.

Comrade Polinow discussed the conception of freedom in our so-called democracies. He stressed the fact that Marcus Graham is not being persecuted for his illegal entry into this country, but for his beliefs and ideals that he is spreading among the masses. He concluded with a reading of Graham's poem "Third Degree" from his book, "An Anthology of Revolutionary Poetry" which relates of an actual episode of his life.

At the conclusion of these talks the gathering unanimously adopted a resolution, demanding the liberation of Marcus Graham from all accusations, and that the Warrant of Deportation as well as the Contempt of Court charges be summarily revoked. The resolution was forwarded to Miss Perkins, Secretary of Labor.

Develop your life in all directions, be an individual; as rich as possible in intensive and extensive energy; therefore be the most social and sociable being.

J. M. GUYAU

freedom of the whole depends upon the freedom of the individual; only if each individual is free, then only can society be free.

A Non-anarchist Interpretation

In its "anarchist interpretation of the Spanish revolution", the platform of the F.A.I. speaks much of "collective possession", of a "collective character", of "collective interests" which all combined it calls repeatedly "a new state of things". No attempt has been made to view the standpoint of the individual and try to show in what way and measure the Spanish revolution has freed the individual from the thrall of authority, being the nucleus of any revolution, as promoted and carried through by anarchism.

By omitting this, the F.A.I. has unwittingly fostered greatly the aims of fascism or marxism. Both are foisted upon the conception, contrary to anarchism, that the benefit of an abstract whole (government, the people, the nation, the party) is concomitant with the benefit of the individual. For this reason the individual has to submit to all "wholes", enumerated above.

In contradistinction to this, anarchism teaches that only the right of each individual is to be unencroached, and that therefrom flows by itself the welfare of the whole. This is incontestably so true, that the promotion of the "whole" at the cost of the I, leads towards an hierarchy of dominant parasites, who claim to be the selected representatives of the "whole", and to the ruin and misery of vast majorities.

Now, for the first time, a revised platform of an anarchist organization has given up this correct standpoint and point of view of anarchism. I consider this fact as the greatest pitfall for our international movement. At the same time it is scientifically unsound and wrong; it leads straight towards marxian-fascist principles, and what is still worse, allows their practice—in the name of "anarchism". . .

Pierre Ramus

(To be concluded)

IN RETROSPECT OF CURRENT EVENTS

The Harlan Trial and Justice

The trial of 21 former peace officers and 35 coal corporation and company executives of Harlan County, under the 1870 Civil Rights Act, instituted by the Federal Government, in London, Kentucky, ended in a mistrial. The jury could not agree upon the guilt of the accused. As a consequence, they were all freed.

No less than 1200 pages were consumed to make up the court record of the testimony of 569 witnesses taken within 53 days at a cost of \$300,000. Federal Judge H. Church Ford, did his very best to aid in the government's persecution of the accused.

Bloody Harlan dates back to 1931, when a dozen miners were murdered by sheriffs and coal company thugs, ending in the sentencing to life-imprisonment of seven miners, four of whom are still imprisoned. But since 1931 there have been many more victims of the prevailing terror in the Kentucky mine area. Not only have workers' lives become unsafe, but likewise the lives of all such intellectuals who ventured to enter Kentucky in order to test out its "justice". Houses of miners were set afire and bombed. Striking miners were driven from their homes or shot down. Well known authors were jailed, beaten and deported from the mine area.

It is such a state of injustice that the Federal government set out to remedy, by bringing about some of the living culprits to trial.

Reporters were amazed at the brazen methods employed by the defendants to clear themselves of the charges of murder, bombings and other similar misdeeds. Their witnesses lied as best as they could. Some recanted. Nevertheless, the testimony revealed: One woman was offered \$100.00 a head to lure miners into the woods. One miner, it was proven, might have had medical attention for his child, had he not joined the union. Miners were shot to death and their houses burned.

During the very course of the trial a government witness, Lester Smithers, was shot as was Frank White, former deputy sheriff, who was to "tell all". Houses of witnesses were dynamited. In short, the old bloody Harlan came back to life once again to demonstrate its infamous record.

Not even the whole machinery of the federal government could bring the thugs who reigned, and are still reigning, over the Kentucky mine area, to justice.

The helplessness of "legal" justice has never yet revealed itself in such an emphatic manner as in this "mistrial" verdict.

True justice is the very anti-thesis of legal justice, and its dawn cannot be brought about by any government agency—but only by those human beings who come to a realization of the need for a basic change in the entire structure of the economic, political and social life under which we live.

* * *

Fruits of American Imperialism

On Palm Sunday 1937, 21 persons were killed and 100 injured at Ponce, Puerto Rico. Most of the killed and wounded were "anti-U. S. Nationalists", that is: anti-imperialists.

The last week in July of this year Governor Blanton Winship on the same spot—Ponce—staged a 40th anniversary of the American imperialist occupation of Puerto Rico.

Denouncing the "celebration" as a "shameless disgrace", anti-imperialists fired 65 to 80 shots, killing two officials and wounding 32. The life of Governor Blanton Winship was saved by a Puerto Rican official who shielded him with his own body. Nevertheless, one bullet hit the Governor slightly.

President Roosevelt has many times tried to create the impression that his administration is pursuing an anti-imperialist policy, supplanting it by a "good-neighbor" one. The anti-imperialist manner in which the Puerto Ricans themselves have expressed at Ponce in 1937 and this year gives lie to the claims of President Roosevelt.

Whenever individuals arise amidst a people to risk their own lives by such forceful demonstrations as the Puerto Ricans have done, then the oppression that American occupation is inflicting upon that nation can easily be guessed at.

All that Governor Winship could deduct from the attack was, to exclaim: "What poor shots they are!" And President Roosevelt revealed his calibre of understanding by merely wiring his congratulation to the Governor in having escaped assassination.

Which only goes to prove again what fools are today governing mankind! Not only are they ready to sacrifice and risk other peoples' lives, but they lack even sufficient understanding of how to avoid subjecting their own lives to the very same risk and sacrifice.

The fruits of American imperialism are identically the same as the harvests resulting from imperialist conquests the world over. And as long as imperialism continues to prevail, neither the lives of the ruled and rulers are safe at any time from such explosions as has taken place in Puerto Rico during the last two years.

The Plight of Political Refugees

The two conferences held this year at Evian-le-Bains, France, to deal with the world problem of political refugees, are events of tragical importance.

Twenty-nine Governments participated in the two conferences. As the first International Conference held at Geneva, Switzerland, in 1936, the last two were solely conferences called by Governments and made up of Governments.

What are political refugees?

These are people who have either been singled out for persecution due to race, color or creed, as the Jews in Germany since Hitler's ascendancy, or all such that hold divergent political views from those of the reigning regimes in their respective countries. In either case, the persecuted are forced to flee from their native lands and seek asylum in some other country.

The persecution of human beings could not be carried out without the agencies of the governments. In fact, it is the acts of governments that are alone the sole cause for prompting people to flee from any given territory to another.

So, when we witness how the same Governments have yet the affrontry to constitute themselves as a body pre-

Frankly speaking, we are glad that the American Labor Party has so swiftly revealed itself unashamed and unmindful of the consequences. If there will be still found any workers ready and willing to render material and moral aid to the dealings of this new "labor" party, they can only have our sympathy and pity.

"The American Legion as Educator"

To Professor William Gellerman of Northwestern University, himself a war veteran and member of the American Legion, goes the credit for placing the spotlight on the most potential fascist organization in America, the American Legion. In a thesis entitled "The American Legion as Educator", that Prof. Gellerman submitted two years ago for his Ph. D. at Columbia's Teachers College, he charged, that: a) Legion leaders "have come from a class in American society which has profited from existing social and economic arrangements; b) chief activity of the Legion is fighting subversive elements and it has sponsored teaching of chauvinistic patriotism in the schools; c) Capitalistic and militaristic, the Legion confuses "the middle class concerning its real interests," is "a potential force in the direction of fascism in the U. S." To the discredit of the National Education Association (numbering 225,000 out of 1,000,000 school teachers), meeting in its 76th N. E. A. convention early in July, it disowned Professor Gellerman's thesis—because it solicits the Legion's aid in obtaining more funds for schools.

Even the arch conservative New York Herald-Tribune couldn't swallow the educators' whitewash. It commented:

"Has the Legion ever distinguished itself by any intelligent or sustained stand for civil liberties, free speech, or the rights of the individual? We doubt it. Not a pressure group? Why, it has been, on occasion, one of the most arrogant and powerful and vindictive of all the pressure groups . . . "

The Legion's record in every strike of any importance has been one of scabbing, or the protection of scabs, and of acting as an auxiliary body to the police, sheriffs and national Guardsmen in the latter's attacks upon the striking workers. This alone substantiates more than anything else might, Dr. Gellerman's charges.

* * *

From Marx to the Pope

The latest summersault exhibited by the Communist Party in its stretching forth the olive branch to the Catholic Church, has caused many heart-aches within its own circles, and more so among its sympathizers.

With some, it has caused no surprise at all. That is, with students of the socialist movement.

"The end justifies the means", enunciated Marx. And he lived up to it to a dot. Was it needed to label a stronger opponent as a spy (as in the instance of his fight with Michael Bakunine)? Marx did not hesitate to employ it. Or, was it needed to unite with shady characters for political expediency? Marx again didn't hesitate.

Frederick Engels did the same. So did scores of lesser renown socialists throughout the world.

It was with Lenin as the head of government machine (in Russia) that Marx's motto received its fullest materialization. "You can lie to your own friends", laid down Lenin a new formula. And jailing and shooting of opponents, or his own party men, followed only to become the common rule. Leon Trotsky assented and cooperated in the doings of Lenin. Josef Stalin took hold only where the last two left off.

Any one acquainted in the least with the Catholic Church knows only too well that the tactics employed by Marx and his disciples bear the closest resemblance to those employed by the Roman papacy: Jesuitism plus murder.

So, why should then anyone be shocked to witness the communists stretching forth their jesuitical hands to the Jesuits of the Catholic Church?

It is an excellent union. In excellent taste. And most appropriate as well as timely. All congratulations are due to the communists for throwing off their masks as pseudo-revolutionaries and atheists.

The devil has found its twin brother. May they live long enough to die together in a long overdue marriage that is about to be consummated.

* * *

"The Socialist Appeal" on Anarchists

Leon Trotsky has had a good deal to say on the Anarchist's role in Spain in the "Socialist Appeal" of January 8 and 15, 1938. So has the editor Max Shachtman, in the issue of July 23. It would require a more detailed analysis of their criticism than the present space permits. Presently, one can but point out to the editor of the "Socialist Appeal", that he is either consciously or unconsciously stating an untruth, when writing:

And throughout the world you must look with a micro-scope in the various anarchist periodicals, for a single strong line of protest against the perfidious Montsenys and Olivares, for a single serious re-examination of the anarchist policy of the C.N.T. and F.A.I. in Spain.

It so happens that the "Socialist Appeal" exchanges with MANI. Is it then possible that it has escaped Mr. Shachtman's notice that this anarchist journal has taken a critical position towards the C.N.T. and F.A.I. from that very first moment when they entered the government?

And, if Mr. Shachtman wishes us to furnish him a list of other language speaking Anarchist publications in the United States and Europe that have taken a similar critical position, we will gladly oblige him.

Misrepresenting your opponent is something that at least a Trotskyist organ, one might have expected not to make use of, in view of the experiences that their entire movement has been subjected to by their brethren of yesterday—the Stalinists.

Or, should one conclude from their readiness to misrepresent anarchists, that they are still brothers under the skin of Stalin and all that Stalinism implies?

MANI

A Monthly Journal of the Anarchist Ideal and Movement

MARCUS GRAHAM, Editor

Subscription Price: \$1.00 per year, 6 months—50c
Sample Copies Free Upon Request.

MANI invites the collaboration of all workers and artists who are in sympathy with our ideas to send us essays, poems, and drawings. No payment can be made. Where return of manuscript is desired sufficient postage should be included.

Administration and Editorial Address
MANI
P. O. Box 971
Los Angeles, Calif., U.S.A.

The Game of Politics

"Politic" defines Webster, as: "artful" and "cunning". And truth, to tell, one is not aware of any past or present existing political party that has as yet failed to live up to the definition of "politic" given by Webster.

In speaking of the American Labor Party, we had occasion to point out that the workers need but take a glance at the past experiences of the workers in Austria, Germany, Great Britain, France and Russia, in order to realize what disillusionments are in store for them, should they lend support to the newly devised scheme of those who ride upon the backs of labor.

But a short time has passed since we offered our opinion and we already witness the American Labor Party concluding deals with the "Grand Old" Republican Party of New York State. Let history record the fact too, that before concluding this deal, the leaders of the same party were willing to sell the labor vote to Tammany Hall, but not enough fat jobs in return could be elicited. Thus, the labor vote went to the highest bidder, as at any other auction of plain merchandise.

REFLECTIONS ON LIBERTY

The Outlook

Upon a groaning humanity preys a type of barbarian, called the politician. An engine of depredation—the State—ever avid for greater territory and authority, encroaches with accelerating rapidity on the bodies and souls of men. How dearly does the herd-man pay for his regimentation and doles! Which is perhaps as it should be. If he but understood the preposterous frauds and bluff perpetrated upon him! How many scan the horizon in hopelessness, reluctant to enter the stream of prejudice and stupidity, of cupidity and downright political chicanery—yet aware of the possibility of averting cataclysm? Perhaps the achievement of liberty rests on a pacific disposition, who knows? Surely, on respect for one's neighbor's individuality. Is the love of liberty an instinct? Or does it await intelligent self-interest? Howbeit, both this love and intelligence seem absolutely essential if freedom is to reign. For we see only too prevalent blind and fruitless aspirations inevitably leading to disaster, alongside such passive intelligence as to be effective not at all. It behoves those with self-respect to become serious about the social outlook.

On Liberty

What is liberty? Would it be rather disconcerting to many self-styled libertarians to learn that they are but feebly aware of the meaning of liberty, and the reasons why the concept arose? Liberty was thought of only because of the nature of individuality, which is known only by differences. Were we all alike, or in agreement, no such concept as liberty could have arisen in the human mind, and, indeed, there would be no social problems. The fact that we differ and disagree, that we have various tastes, needs, wants, and opinions, which must necessarily come into conflict with our union, should urge us to be free from interference one from another. Liberty, thus necessarily has disassociation as a basic recourse. And to be free means to be as independent as one wills, or as interdependent as each, to his own satisfaction, finds mutually advantageous. Unity? Ah, yes! Unity, but only on the proposition that disunity is the basis of human harmony and genuine solidarity. How paradoxical this all sounds!

Security vs. Liberty

Unfortunately it is that many, if not most, libertarians confuse liberty with economic security. Thus, as security is usually found in association, practically every panacea sailing under the banner of liberty has as its essence some form of monopolistic union, usually some monopoly of function by the State! Further, liberty has been so confused with levism and such denials of independence as are implied in socialism and communism, that this confusion has unwittingly been the abettor of reaction. Startling as it might seem the bald fact is that such proposals are "securitarian" rather than libertarian. And in practice will soon be found to degenerate into the most insidious forms of tyranny.

Individualism vs. Collectivism

In the world of social thought, two completely incompatible world outlooks, or as the German's have it, *weltanschauungen* come into conflict. Individualism rests on the autonomy of the individual; collectivism embraces the group viewpoint. The first seeks the greatest amount of individual liberty, for the individual as such; the second seeks to make the individual happy in some form of corporate existence,—ever searching for some ideal scheme of association, its exponents are essentially organizers. Aiming primarily at material well-being, collectivism is primarily materialistic; while individualism, aiming at the unqualified liberty of the individual, may be called, for want of a better term, spiritualistic, or perhaps better, idealistic.

Individualism offers no specific form of association, but stipulates instead that whatever forms existing in compatibility with liberty must exist by virtue of the voluntary consent of participants, i.e. they must be mutualistic; collectivism, on the other hand, assuming the necessity of interdependence, and searching for associational forms, must depend on stated reciprocal duties, both in relation of each to the other and of all to the collectivity. On the pretext of humanitarianism, such enforced cooperation as are implied in communism, socialism, syndicalism, co-operatives nationalism, the corporate state—these are all but manifestations of the same herd idea—bid for adherents. There are two conditions of mind,—and this is the fundamental difference between these world outlooks: Collectivism is based on an organic conception of society; Individualism takes an anarchistic view,—and the battle will be fought along these lines: whether or not the individual is to submerge his individuality in the mass. (It must not be inferred that all those who call themselves "individualists" actually accept the anarchistic view. Many are merely herd-men apologists of "democratic" status quo.)

A few derivations may be noted. In associational activity, the less definite the duties prescribed, the more insidious and debilitating will be the mutual control, leading finally into mutual distrust and ultimate disintegration. All governments, all governmental schemes, all formulas of association (socialism, communism, fascism, etc.)—all these are but applications of the herd-instinct bent on subjugating the individual for the supposed common good—are destined to go upon the rocks as soon as the individual recognizes himself, his self-respect and dignity as a unique being. For the individual is indestructible; he existed prior to institutions and forms of association, he is superior to them and when he realizes himself will accept no duties except those which he voluntarily assumes.

On the Progress of Society

A study of the history of man will evince a process of differentiation. Both economic and political progress has been in the direction of decentralization, notwithstanding the fact of increased interdependence. The trend has been from status to contract. And any attempt to achieve security at the expense of this tendency will be met with such obstacles as tend to freeze the status quo. This is the meaning of fascism, in the face of the growing movements for "collectivization". In attempting to bar one evil, society allows the same evil to enter, but through another door. Instead of trying to break monopoly, social movements seek to capture it, and in the rush any distinction between political and economic becomes immaterial. The mass-man is having his day!

The difference between Marxism (and other group schemes) and Anarchism plainly indicate the struggle between mere physical satisfactions and the emancipation of the soul of man. Marxism is essentially a "bear philosophy"—material well-being is placed above individual inclinations in their varieties of the urge to life and expression. What has mutual aid, whether voluntary or enforced, to do with individuality? Nothing, except as a means. Its motive is economic security rather than individual liberty. Not that anarchists are not concerned with material well-being, not at all, although liberty does not mean freedom from folly nor from beans. Even while a slave waxes fat, a free man could starve. But would he when access to the means of livelihood shall have been divorced from law-made monopoly, whether private or collective? And would he not prefer to associate whenever and however such appeared servicable to him? Has he need of professional organizers?

Equality vs. Leadership

Only similarities can be measured. And men, rather than

being equal, are dissimilar. To speak of equality without referring to specific qualities and abilities is to utter sounds. In specific things men are not equal, but in social value they may become so. This is the function of competition to achieve by adjusting and equilibrating social forces. Both consciously and unconsciously, every social action testifies to the fact that equality is the social ideal. But does equality negate leadership? Hardly.

Associational activity requires direction and aim. And it is part of the function of division of labor to select leadership. This would be true even if men were equal in managerial ability, for organization requires coordination. Even so, but they are not. Some lack the initiative to direct and coordinate. This, again, does not mean that they may not be equal in social value. To repeat, competition and supply and demand would adjust that. Would artists, poets, inventors, and other pioneers and innovators be fitted for, say industrial management? It is unlikely.

In a free society a man would find his place, for competition would impel him to gravitate to where his talents and merits would be recognized, and if these were faculties for coordinating he would be recognized as a natural leader by those who acceded to his ability, in whatever particular field it might be. In the diversity of functions he would assume that of director. By the very fact of freedom he could not monopolize this function nor could he coerce because he could direct only those who had confidence in his judgement. Moreover he must meet the competition of other leaders who might undermine his pretensions by displaying better ability. Thus associational activity would be in a continual flux. For a free society is a mutual society, and no one can predict with certainty what its precise condition may be. But no institution would exist that purported to be the expression of all.

Fatality vs. Free Will

Science postulates an inevitability in the nature of things. It discovers knowledge, not invents it. Invention is the adaptation of knowledge to human needs. But men seem to have the faculty of choice. Man abhors the idea of fatality to his will. And this abhorrence and the feeling of self-will, in all probability, has a factual basis. Man's problem, then, is to reconcile his will with the inevitable, and this can be done only when he understands the nature of the latter. So it is with social relations. It is for the individual to study and understand the laws of human association that promotes initiative, responsibility, and harmony, and apply them to whatever forms of association that he may find will most satisfactorily serve a given purpose. This can be done only when he can associate and disassociate at will¹—that is in a regime of liberty, or, if you prefer, anarchy. Man learns by trial and error, and these can have free play only in a free society, never, as far as the individual is concerned, in a governed society. Thus, social harmony can never be fully achieved pending the abolition of the State, and that should be the aim of every reform.

Progress consists in reconciling contradictions and social antagonisms for the purpose of equilibrium and harmony. It is no doubt a conscious process, and bears no stamp of determinism. Rather does the belief in a providential ameliorator, either in the form of fate or supermundane intelligence, but

revert to the forward social movement.

On Economics

One thing appears certain: liberty, as well as life itself, must stand on such an economic foundation as will not infringe on the opportunity for individual independence. For those who wield economic control, hold all control, and no liberty is secure without, or is so important as, economic liberty. And no "group control" will mean but group tyranny. The freedom of the individual must be exercised at his own cost. Only incompetents preach sacrifice; only fools practice it.

As a science, economics deals with the mutual relations between men who are engaged in the production and distribution of wealth. These relations must be mutual, that is, voluntarily agreed upon, the only other alternative being arbitrary delegation of function and arbitrary distribution determined by a ruling hierarchy. In the latter case, economic control departs from the interactions of free agreement and enters the field of despotic whim, and nothing is scientific or predictable, neither are the courses of action subject to rational social analysis. In this writer's view, all forms of collectivism, such as communism, socialism, the corporate state, as well as monopoly capitalism, admit of no rationalization into principles of economic law, because that great controlling and equalizing factor—competition—has been either in whole or in part wiped out.

In life, principles which are experienced, perceived, and conceived are contradictory in the nature of their effects. Contradiction being fundamental and inevitable, the social problem becomes one of reconciliation and equilibrium. The harmonious synthesis of opposites can be achieved only through liberty,—only freedom to discriminate and choose between the beneficial and harmful effects of these principles will solve the problem of social harmony.

Association is not an organic law. Organization, in itself, is an evil in that it necessarily violates liberty which, because of the fundamental cause of the social problem—the nature of individuality—implies some degree of disassociation. If and as long as the individual is free to decide just how much liberty he wishes to cede in order to gain the benefits of association, his natural liberty has not been invaded. Thus, as collectivism and independence are antithetical, the social problem becomes not one of organization (or association), but one of mutuality, which arises only among free men when conditions permit of acceptance and rejection. Social control, in a free society, is effected not from organic relationships, but from the ability to non-cooperate (boycott, for instance).

Competition is the great force making for equilibrium and equity. Operating through the pressure of voluntary and independent or semi-independent productive groups which, as a whole, constitute a cooperative society, it regulates the division of labor, proportions production, socializes knowledge, spurs progress, and is a guarantee of independence. With the rise of division of labor, the control of cooperation takes a different form than direct supervision, and this form is called competition.

Monopoly, like property, in some forms or applications is an evil, that is, both a hindrance to production and a cause of maldistribution. Its essence is exclusion, an essential for independence, yet if indiscriminately applied violates liberty. The purpose of monopoly should be to preserve independence without violating liberty. Monopoly may also arise during the natural operation of economic law under liberty. But if and when it does, it is always subject to potential competition, which insures against its abuse. Legal monopoly leads immediately to corruption and exploitation.

Property

The idea of property arose as a necessary corollary to liberty, but a misuse of the principle to rights and circumstances in which its original and basic demands do not exist is the primary cause of the world's economic conflicts.

Property does not exist because products are the result of labor. Property is expedient to guarantee the right of independence. Labor merely designates who is to be the pro-

¹No one can disassociate himself from the State.

prietor of what. Even if wealth (rather say material goods) could be had without labor, even if it were superabundant, and although the instinct for possession would be considerably weakened because of the resultant security, the necessity for property would still exist because differences of opinion require separation and independence for the insurance of harmony. Common ownership and difference of opinion leads to dissatisfaction, coercion, or a fight.

Men produce for results: the inconveniences of their failures should devolve on themselves, not others. Because concrete things can be used only by a limited number of persons, at one place, and at one time, a labor basis for property exists as a spur to initiative, and as an insurance of responsibility. To be free, the individual should be at liberty to act as he wills, but at his own cost, (i.e. to the detriment of his own life and property). Common ownership involves such an indiscriminate sharing of benefits and penalties as would probably result in universal irresponsibility or mutual distrust (or what is more probable, either centralized or mob tyranny).

In the name of liberty, collectivistic proposals are advanced on the pretext that technological development has reached the stage where there may be produced plenty for all. These proposals take two political forms: a society wherein productive and distributive arrangements are conducted by "technocrats", or rule from above on the order of the corporate state; and one ruled from the bottom as proposed by "communist-anarchists" whose law of economic distribution is "from each according to his ability; to each according to his needs". In the latter, the stimulus to produce, it is claimed, would exist because man has so much energy which he must use up anyway, and because man is naturally "creative". Whatever merit this claim may possess it fails to note a difference between work and play. Work is a necessity, nearly always irksome, prompted by our needs; play is a voluntary pursuit, nearly always non-productive, prompted by our desires. Work should be paid for in its results; play is its own reward. No amount of verbal quibbling by disguised egoists (such as "products are not individual but social") will demolish this distinction. As soon as a departure is made from the basic law of benefit proportional to effort, as a social principle, the stimulus to produce begins to vanish. The paternalism of the family must be reversed in the economic relations between adults. Communism is indeed the philosophy of the child-minded.

On Exchange: the concomitant of the division of labor

As society advances through division of labor, the relations between individuals become increasingly dependent upon what division of labor implies—Exchange. Whosoever controls the issue or the terms of issue of circulating medium controls the relations which we have toward each other—controls the terms of which, and even if we may, exchange (i.e. cooperate) with one another. And by the use of such control, not only are we being robbed of the fruits of our labor but the ownership of the earth and everything therein is being rapidly monopolized by financiers.

Money, especially credit money, is undoubtedly one of the greatest of cooperative discoveries. Without it no great specialization of labor seems possible, except under an all-inclusive state control of industry, and even here something of its nature would be necessary to maintain a check of and on consumption.

Governments have always, both directly and indirectly, mortgaged the people to financial bandits. There is only one remedy, that is the free opportunity of any individual or combination of individuals to issue money and credit instruments to any and all participants who will voluntarily accept them as an earnest for goods. And thus, through the free competition of both reputable and disreputable financiers will the latter be crowded out by lack of patronage, and interest-bearing money, and the interest-bearing power of everything will buy, be a thing of the past. No form of legally monopolized banking, the nature of things being what it is, will ever accomplish this end.

Perhaps the greatest menace to individual liberty today are the numerous crack-brained governmental money reform schemes which have sprung into existence in the interim since the philosophy of liberty designated anarchism has been discredited by certain well-intentioned herd-scheme zealots. However, whoever fails to understand the power of money and also its utility and necessity, or fails to realize that the solution of the money problem is imperatively prior to and the fundamental solution of nearly all other social problems, fails to that extent in being an effective influence toward the advancement of the happiness and social well-being of mankind, and becomes not only a ridiculous utopian but an unwitting contributor to reaction in the opinion of those who have made a study of liberty in cooperation.

On Value

The concept of value arose only in the process of exchange. When two men come together to exchange things, they each evaluate the relative importance of each article to themselves. If a rate of exchange is agreed upon, each article becomes the measure of value of the other. The value of anything is what you can get for it.

Social value exists only in an exchange economy, only in a competitive economy, only in a property economy. In order for a thing to have value, it must be the property of some one, and it must have utility to some one else who also has something desirable to exchange.

Value is a human estimate; it is measured psychologically by a relation between the intensity of desire and aversion. The intensity of these desires and aversions has many influencing factors, and it is the study of these factors and how they influence the human mind, and by inference distribution, which is the fundamental subject matter of economics.

Labor is not an essential of value. A thing may have value without any labor having been involved in its ownership. But when, and insofar as, free production is in play, labor becomes a factor of value. The measure of value is settled by free agreement involving a complex balancing of desires (utility) and aversions (labor) by each of the parties concerned.

Value is not usually a fair basis for price. In equity, the price of commodities and services should be determined by their labor cost. Labor is "measured" by repugnance (not by time nor energy which are but factors of repugnance), and utility by benefits. Given free access to natural resources and to the prevailing productive knowledge, and free opportunities to exchange irrespective of national boundary lines, and freedom to use whatever money or credit facilities satisfactorily to the parties involved, in short, given a free economy, value approaches cost of production, when it may be said that the value of a product is measured by the utility of the labor necessary to produce it.

Values are not, and cannot be determined in production. It is only in the process of exchange that the utility factor is noted, as values are ascertained by mutual agreement. It takes at least two coinciding opinions, those of producer and consumer, for value to exist in fact.

Values are "socially determined" only under the influence of competition, when there are several producers and several buyers of the thing in question. There is no "socially determined" value when an article is produced by a monopoly, for in such case the competition which socializes the process in a productive efficiency has been suppressed. Money

CRITICISM AND THE ART OF CREATING

Is there any truth in the assumed belief that creativity can only be imputed to a poet or a belletrist, and that the critic is only a parasite who nurtures on the fruits of the creative writer? Is the relation between author and critic only a mechanical superficiality; or to express it more rudely: the critic is merely a pest, a nuisance, a fabrication of people for whom the paradise of real creativeness is shut tight and must therefore seek an avenging satisfaction on the poets and authors by inventing this useless unproductive criticism?

Wells of ink have already been spilled in an effort to throw some light on the subject; and the fountain that has been wasted, especially on Jewish literature, is not of the smallest. I shall, therefore, try to add a few more drops of it, attempting, very delicately, almost on the point of a finger, to give my views on the much-disputed subject.

The inter-relation of writing and criticism is in itself organic and creative. Not only is there no real criticism without potential creative skill, but there is also no real creativeness without potential qualifications in criticism. Real criticism and real creativeness (the reader will bear in mind that only the real, the ideal sense of a problem can be taken in consideration when treating it abstractly) always go hand in hand, giving priority to one phase of the problem as well as to the other, just as identical matter in a living organism form separate parts in body-structure.

A poet's lyric "I sing the song of the bird" is very beautiful indeed; but in reality it is only true in exceptional cases—and then only in unpretentious works. In true realism the verse does not emanate from his pen as easily as the song from the bird. The serious author must labor hard for his verse to attain the trilling lightness of a bird-song. And the process of hard labor, we must remember, is being directly influenced by critical perception. Poet or writer devoid of critical imagination will never succeed in producing an important or complete work. They are incapable of noticing any flaws that are bound to creep in while sketching out their thoughts and visions on paper. The unavoidable "scissors" usually required in the embodying of a vision or an idea diminishes, or rather reduces itself to a minimum

when controlled by the aid of critical imagination that keeps on comparing the vision with the embodiment and warns the author of every false step.

Let us take the Jewish literature as an outstanding example. If Sholom Ash, for instance, would possess a critical view; if, besides being a writer he would also be a critic—his works would be more than a hundred percent better. Sholom Ash is a real author, a writer with an impulse, but his creations are not filtered by the critical perception; there is no confrontation between vision and embodiment, and the result is very much disappointing. One can experiment by eliminating superfluous phrases or expressions; or by sifting or nuancing certain dialogues and portrayals in Ash's works, thereby contributing much to their literary merit. That can be observed in the translations of his works. The slightest polishing of style in the translation of a work adds much to its literary worth. Sholom Ash could easily avoid this if he should possess a critical viewpoint.

Criticism, as we can see, is the critical perception—a part-attribute to original creating without which the latter could not produce a complete masterpiece if the critical factor is lacking in control.

But just as original creating cannot be fancied without critical perception so is real criticism impossible without creative potentiality. Only that critic who is imbued with creative vision; who is capable of embracing critically the author and in clear vision observe his idealistic perfection—only he has the proper requisites for observing, for feeling and for clarifying the lacking qualities in creative perfectedness. Only that critic who approaches a portrayed character with creative intuition and observes him in his ideal form, as he appears to the author's vision—only such critic can sense the false pretensions of the character's speech and actions. Real criticism is not an outward contribution, relying only on rationally-developed plots that are thrown about a realistic production like the encircling rings around a cask; real criticism draws its criterion from the inward, from the same source whence comes original creativity. Just as an author cannot portray a live person or a situation from the outward, but must actually live in them; just as he is incapable of embodying a human problem unless

values (prices) rise and fall under the influence of supply and demand, thereby affecting the remuneration of producers in such manner as to impel them to gravitate to the most remunerative industry, thus both proportioning effort to social need and, through competition, achieving equity in compensation for productive effort.

Values are continually changing due to changes in desire (style, custom, opinion, etc.) and changing technological development which reflects upon the ease of accomplishing results. Given freedom, the less human labor the less the value.

An idea of the complexity of value estimates may be had by considering some of the influencing factors:—Material, judgement, risk, time, energy, personal inclinations, (individual responsibility are valuable qualities of human service) these affect value from the productive standpoint (i. e. the labor or aversion factor); scarcity, artistic considerations, personal and social estimates, sex, ambition, emulations, habit, custom, tradition, style, religion, time, place, climate, topography, durability, etc. affect value from the consumer's standpoint (i. e. the utility or desire factor).

A fairly firm grasp on the significance of, and the effect of the influences determining, value is essential for understanding the apportionment which obtains in a freely competitive economy. It may be said with certainty that it is the influence of law-made economic restrictions which are the basic causes of inequity and human exploitation.

On Government and Law

It is monopoly created by law; it is competition suppressed by law; it is law, law and government—how can this truism be impressed into the stupid heads of those who are perpetually clamoring for laws, censorships, prohibitions—that creates the damnable conditions in society. Law and Government! Investigate the nature of these frauds. Liberty vs. law and government! This is the problem for suffering humanity to study and in which it must make a decision. Perhaps the greatest social aphorism ever uttered was that of Proudhon's:

"Liberty not the Daughter, but the Mother of Order."

One thing may be well to keep in mind: Every movement resorting to the State as a way out of man's predicament is but accelerating a drift the resultant of which is what is currently termed Fascism. And I believe the road is not hampered by misguided humanitarians who deem collectivism a solution and who expect to achieve their aims through a "revolution" in which they expect to "take over the means of production". Without well-defined aims for the immediate future, yet tempered by expediency, the present turn of events becomes highly problematical. For a while there is always a possibility for the better, history shows also a possibility for something decidedly worse.

Anarchism

Society is in a process of formation, one might say also of organization. Anarchism is not a condition, but is a force or tendency making for liberty during this formation period. Anarchy might be said to be a state of liberty toward which society aims, but anarchism should be considered as the dynamic force moving always in that direction. With this view of terms the following expression, "there is less liberty today than formerly, but there is more anarchism", becomes intelligible and illuminating.

A utopian is one who attempts to do something without full knowledge of the facts involved. A utopian is usually looking for a condition, he expects society to "arrive" somewhere. Many, probably most, anarchists are utopians, in more senses than one. But anarchism is not utopian, neither is it "scientific" except as a method, it is a fact of life. Anarchism is the force, will, instinct (call it what you will) that tends to free the individual from mass control.

In one sense, and unfortunately, anarchism is not, and never will be, a mass movement. Its pivotal strength will ever be a minority, and the further on the progressive road they be, the smaller will be that minority. The mass minded man is usually a wrecker and a despot. We plainly see the latter type in the dictatorships of today, which are creating havoc with the human spirit and despoiling the hopes, aspirations, and enthusiasms of men. Every demagogue is an altruist who promises succor to the mass—those credulous believers in altruism.

The ideal of anarchism, being a voluntary society, obviously cannot be attained through violence, nor through civil war (these are extraneous to anarchism itself), but will, however, necessarily come through rebellion and flouting the prevailing conditions and morals. The libertarian revolution is a revolution of the spirit, advancing when and as men awaken and assert themselves as men, i. e. as Supermen, over and above any that had heretofore existed on this planet. But this may be incomprehensible metaphysics to the materialist.

Anarchists are nearly always optimistic in that they will ever believe that, whatever the conditions may be at the moment, more liberty is always possible.

On Communism

A "science" that becomes effective, in practice, only by the use of guns, bayonets, and prisons. By the sweeping aside of the Magna Charta that had been wrested from authority only after years of summary indictments and punishments. I suppose it is "bourgeois" like many of the other hardly-fight-for civilizing forces of society!

The fallacy of combinations as a social principle may be readily seen even in the institution of marriage. Legal and religious marriage is a form of mutual monopoly, often involuntary, hence tyrannical. So with all involuntary unions. The only "out" is to supplant combination by separation, and by making liberty and competition (natural selection) the controlling social forces.

By adopting communism or the indiscriminate sharing of benefits and penalties as an economic principle is to put incompetency on par with competency. Thus will another form of aristocracy be laid upon society—the aristocracy of incompetency. Another proof that communism is the philosophy of incompetents. There is one merit to the proposal, however, in that such an aristocracy will be so easy to enter. The result will be what is the unconscious aim of society—equality—but the equalizing process will be—DOWN. The salvation of the world does not lie in substituting one form of parasitism for another.

"Rights" are granted; "duties" are enforced. To speak of rights and duties is to think in terms of authority. Beware of the demagogue who speaks of your rights, for he will soon be eager to impose duties upon you.

Fundamentally, Capitalism, Communism, and Fascism are of one piece, they all consider society an organism, with the individual but a spark in the social body. But the individual preceded society, and if necessary can live without it! Destroy the individual and you destroy society; but if society disbanded tomorrow individuals would continue to exist. Oh! When will the herd instinct with its consequent political superstition vanish from the human mind!

(A reply on those parts of the above essay that MAN: does not agree with will appear in the forthcoming issue EDITOR.)

With the crowd of common-place chattering we are already past praying for; no reproach is too bitter for us, no epithet too insulting. Public speakers on social and political subjects find that abuse of Anarchists is an unfailing passport to popular favor. Every conceivable crime is laid to our charge, and opinion, too indolent to learn the truth, is easily persuaded that Anarchy is but another name for wickedness and chaos.

ELISEE RECLUS

Pro-Anarchist Publications

CHALLENGE, weekly, \$2.00 a year. Station D, Box 177, New York City.

SPAIN and the WORLD, fortnightly, \$1.25 a year. 21 Firth Street, London, W.1, England.

VANGUARD, appears 4-6 times a year. \$1.00 for twelve issues. 45 W. 17 Street, New York City.

he is passionately bound together in love or hate—so is a critic not qualified to outwardly judge characters, portrayals or problems, but must live through them with passionate intimacy. In other words: the author and critic live through identically the same process—a creative process. There are, what we may call, parasite authors; they do not create organically, from inward emotion, but write mechanically, outwardly. Yet there is no parasite criticism, just as there is no parasite creation, because as attributes of the human spirit they are not only both of the same creative process but are even inter-related, as though molded together, only in diversified proportions; and besides, the hegemony is applicable to either one or the other.

There are parasite critics as there are parasite creators. But then they are of the same worth as two sides of a false coin.

(English version by S. Polinow)

I. Rapaport

THE THEATRE AT ITS BEST

"RUN LITTLE CHILLUN!"—A Negro Folk Drama by Hall Johnson. Produced and directed by Clarence Muse, Mayan Theatre, Los Angeles, Cal., July, 1938.

The subject of Love and Religion, man and Nature has never received in our modern theatre such an intelligent and artistic approach as it does in this epic of Mr. Johnson's "Run Little Chillun."

In putting Jim, the son of Rev. Jones, to a crucial test between his wife and the real love that he finds with another woman, Mr. Johnson never compromised with the artistic conception of the struggle.

The whole hypocrisy of the Congregation of Mr. Jones is glaringly depicted. And equally so, in the religious services as well as in the competitive lover to Jim, by the Brother of the New Pilgrims—Moses.

The dialogue, the music and songs are in full harmony with the unfolding of the crucial issues embodied in the play. And greatest and most beautiful is the dance of Love and its fulfillment.

Truly grandiose is the manner in which the cast of 70 of the Federal Theatre and Musical Projects' Negro players enact this epic drama. I for one have never seen any production by white actors to equal in spirit this one. It is played with such sincerity and enthusiasm that one is swept off one's feet—with but one desire: to have every one's friend see it, as well as to see it over and over again.

After Sept. 4th, the play will be transferred to the Greek Theatre in Griffith Park, Los Angeles. If the "city of angels" deserves at all to be visited—it is for the sake of witnessing the most unusual production that the theatre has to offer today.

MAX NOMAD, VILIFYER OF ANARCHISTS

In the March and July issues of MAN! for 1938 was pointed out the hatred and vilifying methods that Max Nomad had used against G. Clancilla in his "Rebels and Renegades". But since that time the vilifications upon anarchists has become a mania with Mr. Nomad.

His latest wholesale vilification is directed against Michael Bakunin, Peter Kropotkin, and principally against Johann Most. It made its appearance in the June issue of the "Modern Monthly", and it is stated therein, that it is the concluding section of a biography on Johann Most, to be published by Little, Brown and Company this year.

At the conclusion of this chapter Mr. Nomad writes:

Blackened, slandered, ridiculed in his life-time, he (Most) had ironically enough very good press notices after his death.

Mr. Nomad had, evidently, by the time he concluded the last part, already forgotten what he had himself written at the beginning of the same chapter about Most, and which is far more deserving of the very epithets of his that he had directed against the press. For, this is how Mr. Nomad describes Most:

. . . the personification of boggadagad, irresponsibility, and hatred, valinglorious, demagogue, intolerant and zealous of possible competitors for leadership.

Those who know the life of Johann Most can feel nothing but contempt for the deliberate vilifications by Mr. Nomad of one of the finest characters that the anarchist movement ever had.

But not satisfied with his defamation of Most alone, Mr. Nomad also brings in Bakunin as well as Kropotkin, as targets for his lying and poisonous pen. And this is how the villain does his dirty job:

. . . Kropotkin's complete "negation" of the State was not taken literally: it was merely a paradoxical expression of his demand for more decentralization of government authority. Most's "negation" of the State was only another version of the Marxist "withering-away-of-the-State". . . In other words, Most was at bottom a Bolshevik—before even that word appeared—even though he believed himself to be the very opposite. . . . There is every indication that Johann Most, were he now alive, would have joined this new school of what is called emancipation. With his Marxist dialectics, his Blanquist will to power, his Bakounist disregard for consistency, he would have no difficulty in bridging the chasm between Anarchy and Dictatorship. . . . A non-conformist all his life, he would have probably joined those opponents of the existing system who see no point in exchanging the capitalist jungle for the "communist" concentration camp.

The misrepresentations, the assumptions and insinuations made by Mr. Nomad about Bakunin, Kropotkin and Most—be fit only one whose demagogic-braveness and sheer defamations are his chief stock in trade.

The Little, Brown and Company publishers would do well indeed to think twice before bringing out a work on the life of one of the most beloved anarchists—written by one of the most disreputable and contemptuous vilifiers of Anarchists.

Marcus Graham

ART and LITERATURE

A Chapter from "Father Diogenes"

The first time father Diogenes was questioned by the State police, he said that he was on his way to Paris. Indeed he would, perhaps, reach it one day. It seems that he was slowly nearing it. It was not a rare thing for him to lie down near a winding creek and linger there all afternoon. He would also sit for hours and hours at the top of a hill if the panorama pleased him. He followed the highways that were attractive for their natural beauty. Sometimes, without hostile intentions or the desire to catch it, he would run and chase a hare.

He wandered about the forests without direction, charmed by nature's preparation for the nearing of Spring. He never hurried nor desired to be in any particular place. In some way was not this foolish man wiser than all others of his epoch?

However, when he reached a cross-road he would consult his compass, then, he would instinctively take the road leading to Paris.

To him there was nothing more whimsical or more delicious than his journey. One month ago he had left Platonople; and for the past two weeks no authority had persecuted or questioned him. Was he being protected by his reputation as a queer tramp, or had the police received orders? They indulgently looked at him when he passed by. Still almost every time they would see him they placed their fingers to their foreheads; one might have thought that it was an exchange of military greetings. And sometimes, in a protective voice, they would say: "Good morning Nature-Man!" He himself had adopted the Greek greeting, and added to it a philosophical thought: "Be merry according to nature."

Upon entering a house he would say: Let peace, joy and the rhythm of nature enter this dwelling with me."

When parting from the people who had invited him, or had let him sleep in their barn, he would repeat, in a tone of prayer—"Let peace, joy and the rhythm of nature remain after me in this dwelling."

Gradually he adopted some formulas, habits and rites for himself. When he would pronounce the words, "rhythm of nature," his hand, perhaps unconsciously, would describe a circular figure. When he was asking for food he would say, "Give me a piece of bread because I am a man and because you too are a man." Sometimes he would simply say, "Man, give a piece of bread to a man."

"What stops you from buying bread with money?"

"Would the bread still be clean? How many times has the most humble coin served ignoble purposes?"

"But isn't money necessary to commerce and exchange?"

"What need is there for exchange? Let everyone give out what he doesn't need and all will have plenty!"

"Well in that case life would become very simple!"

"Have you ever seen true beauty that was not simple?"

We guess that the dialogue varied according to the frame of mind of the interlocutor, but the cynic's doctrine always brought him back to the same line of reasoning.

One month after his departure from Platonople, he was following the water along the left shore of the river Loire. He seemed to have forgotten Paris. The river charmed him. Would he continue along its shores to the sea? Perhaps, but he might also leave it at the next bridge or swim across.

Two gendarmes devoid of any indulgence saw him asking for a piece of bread at a farm. One of them said:

"What do you think of the Ordinance? We have to arrest the Nature-Man! What do you say? The Ordinance stipulates: all beggars. We have seen him begging. That's his luck!"

A young prosecuting Attorney questioned the cynic. No one among those dealing with delinquents ignored the story of the "Nature-Man".

The young judge (no slang, let us speak in noble terms about the magistrates) a curious fellow.

"There are things," said the intelligent young chap, "which though I should wish to, am unable to understand. Why did you not remain a professor?"

The cynic answered in a pleasant voice, "My work—excuse me—my service seemed to me to be as ridiculous as yours."

The judge jumped from his seat, but soon constrained himself like a man who does not wish to hear. He remarked, with the accent of a thinker who has reached the last depth of his thought:

"The position of professor is precious for a man like you who believes to have some disregarded truths to teach."

"When officially taught, the truth becomes a lie."

If the judge had not known in advance that he was dealing with an unbalanced man he would have jumped with abashment. However, above his large mouth his eyes opened wide; he felt himself straightening, his arms rose:

"What do you mean?" he asked.

"If I accept to speak in the name of the State, by means of salary paid by it, what meaning would still have my contempt for the State, I who would accept payment for my teaching?"

"But the present State is not despicable. After so much moral, social, and political progress the State is nothing else but the people themselves."

"The State says, 'I am a delegate of the people,

among the people', as it formerly said, 'I am God's man-deity among the people'. For lies become worn out on their way, and from time to time they must be repaired. To stop lying, the State must cease to exist."

"The despot does not explain anything. SIC VOLO, SIC JUBEO. Would it be that, despotism is your preferred form of government?"

"Is pestilence your preferred disease, your honor? Or because of your politics do you find cholera more advantageous?"

"What connection is there between what you say?" began the judge, shaking his shoulders. But he brightly smiled like a man who suddenly understood.

"Then to you a government would only be a disease?"

"You said it, and you, the most perspicacious of all judges!"

"Still you will admit that there is a difference between our liberal Republic and . . ."

The judge stopped wearily at the edge of the moral precipice. To praise a government, above all the one which pays you, that's a pleasant duty! But to blame



JAYME HAN RYNER

(1861-1938)

any kind of government is always risky. Suppose it becomes the paymaster of to-morrow and you have to judge in its name . . .

"The difference you point out, your honor, is properly incommeasurable. I assure you that I can appreciate it, and congratulate myself for it. Two hundred years ago they would have condemned me in God's or in the King's name. Today I shall be sentenced in my own name; it is I who shall condemn myself through the people who only express my own sovereign will. This thought makes me prouder than I could ever tell you. I glorify myself at the thought that my sovereign will robs me with the voice of the judges. I am at the same time my own prisoner and jailer. I can feel, between my fingers, the keys which lock me in; and it is I who watch and stop my escape. Sociology has reached its apogee. The State of today finally knows the inexhaustible stupidity and idiocy of the masses . . ."

The unbalance man continued:

"He who does not despise the State is an accomplice to the lie; at least by a foolishness caught by the most naive appearances. He accepts the lie because it claims to be the truth. But if it claims to be the truth, is it not, if I dare say, the trade of the lie even as the priest's and judge's Ministries? If I were paid by the lie, and said the truth, I would be like a valet who meditated upon his master."

"I find your past very harsh."

"All men, even judges, have been children. But children who become judges, your honor, are a little more numerous than the children who become men. In my childhood, said the former Diogenes, I dirtied my bed, yet now I don't blush anymore from the memory of this past weakness."

"Thus, you despise all official positions?"

"Do not compel me, your honor, to too often repeat truths which are only useful when told to oneself."

"You could have found a position as a professor in a free educational institution!"

"Please tell me where to find those educational institutions and their precious liberty. Personally I have met, in France, two kinds of teaching, one the slave of the State, the other the slave of the Church."

"This free tuition of which you regret the non-existence, why did you not try to create it yourself? That would have been a noble trial for you."

"Is it because you think that I am insane that you advise me to create insanity? Or do you really think that you can pick up the moon from the bottom of a well?"

"You are not very clear M. Philosopher."

"Because, your honor, your eyes are shut to the most glaring truth. Learn then, since you don't know anything, that he who receives money to speak, necessarily will lie."

"How is that?"

"Truth, Mr. defender of the money-bag, is always disagreeable to money; it chases money. He who wishes to attract money hides the truth. Or if he shows it he does it with a laugh as one shows a ridiculous curiosity. And he calls it a paradox. The auditor hears 'lie', and the auditor is amused, not irritated or instructed."

"It seems that according to your philosophy we ought to work with our hands."

"To whom does the earth belong today? The earth which alone merits to be worked?"

"Then if you had a piece of ground . . . ?"

"I would leave it uncultivated, your honor, for the producing work has been transformed into crime by you."

"You astound me!"

"If I had the simplicity of working, the State would make me an accomplice to all its infamies. By thousands of brutal, direct, subtle, or cunning taxes, it would take the benefits of a greater part of my work. It would be used to fatten its judges, officials, soldiers, generals, and sustain its immense gang of evil-doers."

"You don't mean to tell me that to beg is to obey nature?"

Here the judge touched a soft spot.

"Society has invaded everything. Nothing has been left unembroidered. It has rendered the obedience to nature impossible to everyone."

"Then you, yourself, condemn your attempt."

"I approach nature like an ideal as inaccessible as perfect health. Perfect health is only an idea and a limit. Does that stop you from fighting the disease which comes upon you?"

"But do you believe that beggary . . . ?"

I admire this way of living more than all others, because society despises it more than any other. Show me a more glaring means to express my contempt for your society and for all it boasts. It shows my contempt for money, work, law and for what you emphasize and dare to call honor . . . You make all natural life impossible. At least I want mine as anti-social as possible. I cannot be completely in nature. I exaggerate it instead of belittling it. For I don't live as an egotist, but as an apostle. Do you not understand that I am efficiently spreading this free doctrine, of which you spoke as a blind man speaks of colors? I offer myself as an example to all eyes. There exists a philosophical optic as well as a theatrical optic; and the example that is to be observed must be engrossed."

The poor judge, drowned under the flood of words, and lost in the ocean of paradoxes, could no longer distinguish between what was completely insane and what, perhaps, offered some appearance of reason. He then brought up an argument which seemed to him to be the most powerful:

"If everybody were to beg, what then?"

"If everybody were to be a judge, your honor?"

Hurt by the comparison, the judge harshly remarked,

"That is not the same thing!"

Here Diogenes, instead of answering, burst out in a dazzling laugh. The judge frowned.

"You know that begging is prohibited by law?"

"I am aware of the fact that what you consider to be your duty would make you imprison Diogenes, Jesus and Frank of Assises."

"We have to obey the laws of our time and country."

"Only the laws of nature, your honor. The judges who have obeyed the laws of their time and country poisoned Socrates and crucified Jesus. For a long time they killed the Christian martyrs; then because the laws changed the direction of their cruelties, they burned countless of heretics. The judges who obeyed the laws of their time and country, as soon as their time and its form of lie had passed on, appeared as the most guilty wretches."

Angered and amused at the same time, the young prosecutor continued this controversy for quite a while. Then he went into a conference with the head of the judicial department. They found it unnecessary to divulge the hearing to the public. Still it seemed to be a different task to condemn Diogenes without permitting him to defend himself. This devil of a man would not let himself be gagged and the trial of an ex-University professor, who voluntarily became a tramp and a beggar, would certainly awaken an unhealthy curiosity!

"Let us dismiss the case," said the prosecutor, "he does not remain long at any one place and we shall soon be rid of him."

The judge, once more, wanted to talk with father Diogenes. A few of his questions seemed very inquisitive to the cynic, who answered with an aggressive rougery.

"Do you not find it lonesome being always by yourself?"

"If I were ever lonesome, your honor, it was only when I was not alone."

The judge still remembered with anger the last exchange of words. The brave young man said, with a mixture of affection and naivety quite natural for his age:

"I fear that you will retain a bad opinion of me?"

"Don't fear, your honor, my masters taught me that the most necessary of all virtues is to be able to forget evil." And after a short silence added, "I am very successful in this exercise. I must have a judge or an imbecile in front of me to remember that there exist imbeciles and judges."

Jayme Han Ryner

(English version by Jules Scarceaux)

IDEAS OF ANARCHISM:

(The grammatical and spelling construction has been left intact, as appearing in the book.—EDITOR.)

Prompted by Nature to Freedom

The truth is that not only have I not committed the two crimes for which I was convicted, but I have not stolen a cent nor split a drop of human blood—except my own blood in hard labor—in my whole existence.

But I was prompted by my nature to an ideal of freedom and justice to all—and this is the worst of crimes to my enemies. The fact that for it and for consciousness I have renounced a life of ease and of comfort, to wealth, to worldly ambitions, goods and honors, even to the joys of love—makes me a terrible criminal to the eyes of my judges—a criminal capable of every crime. In fact, I voluntarily submitted myself to hard labor, poverty, dangers and persecutions. Had I reneged my principles after my arrest, I would not find myself, now on the threshold of a death-house, I neither boast nor exalt, nor pity myself. I followed my call, I have my conscience serene, I regret nothing except the unspeakable agony that my destiny causes to my most beloved ones. And strange indeed, I cannot even hate my murderers and my defamers. I even pity them. But oh! how they hate; how they fear; how unhappy they are!

Yet if I had reneged my faith, or become a degenerate, I would presently enjoy privileges and I could hope for freedom. But to the freedom bought as such a price, I prefer the chains and the death.

The Radio and Civilization

I despair, it seems to me that the world is going to hell by radio... My pessimism is based on the blindness of the more, the rascality of the few, the dreadful unconsciousness of all, the tragic destiny and impotence of the exceptional one, the indirect evils of civilization overwhelming the direct benefits and the capacity, bad faith, ignorance, greediness and dearth of power of those who claim to be revolutionists. Evil cannot breed good, to my understanding.

Why I Believe in No Religion

I rebel to the conception of an omniscient god, infinitely good and just omnipotent, who foresees everything, who could make the human good and good-behaving, whereas he let them do bad and afterward punishes them. But history has a nemesis which does not forgive.

I have been born of a Catholic family and believed in Roman Church until my 18 (year)... I believe in no religion... Just for this reason I am for the utmost liberty of conscience... My bases, measures and relation from man to man, is as man to man—and nothing else.

War and Justice

Always and everywhere we find that pauperism is the first cause of war... The justice and the injustice have a common source; the man's respect of himself and of the dignity of the human person. If from these two loves and respects innate in man, follows plans and deeds of equalities in production and distribution, consideration and rights, that is justice. If we, because of these loves and respects are led to establish privileges for us, and those we love more at the expense of others, that is injustice... We have war because we are not sufficiently heroic for a life which does not need war.

State, Law and Violence

The laws are the codified will of the dominating classes; the laws are made to legalize the State organization of violence; the laws and the courts are therefore the tools of the bosses as the judges, police, hangers and spies are their servants. Then an inferior is always wrong, in the courts which are made to uphold the

MAN! is on sale at:

Los Angeles:

Modern Book Shop, 509½ W. 5th Street
Newsstand, Fifth and Main Street.
Newstore 330 N. Main Street.
Smith's Newsstand 613 Hill Street.

San Francisco:

Bookstore, 658 Broadway.
MacDonald's Book Store, 65 Sixth Street.

Chicago, Illinois:

Post Office News Co., 27 Monroe St.

Milwaukee:

Hampel's Book Store, 708 W. Wisconsin Avenue.

New York City:

Biderman's Book Shop, 184 Second Avenue.
Bunn, N. W. Corner of 3rd Avenue and E. 14th Street.

Gordon's Newsstand, 8th Street & Sixth Ave., N. E. Cor.

Grobar's Candy Store, 669 Allerton Ave., Bronx

Labor Book Shop, 28 E. 12th Street.

Maisel Book Store, 424 Grand Street.

Newsstand Allerton Ave. Station, S. E. corner.

Rand Book Store, 7 E. 15th Street.

Roy Skinner, 518 E. 16th Street.

Rutkin, 42nd Street bet. 5th & 6th Ave., op. Stern Bros.

Stern's Newsstand, 28th Street & Sixth Ave., S. E. Cor.

The New Workers Book Store, 131 W. 33rd Street.

Weiseman, 96 E. 14th Street, near 4th Ave.

England:

Revolutionary Youth Federation, 2 Maiden Crescent, N. W. 1., London.

Spain and the World, 21 Frith St., London, W. 1.

The Worker's Friend, 163 Jubilee Street, Mile End, E. 1, London.

FROM THE LETTERS OF SACCO AND VANZETTI

Bartolomeo Vanzetti
(1888-1927)

solidarity means to me . . . I love the solitude. I love the elements. To live free among the green and in the sunshine under an open sky, it was always my dream.

Thought Crucified Comes to Life Again

Ah! do not hasten to say, this is a moral Malady! This, good or bad, this is human Thought. Do not put Thought in prison. It always escapes from it. Do not kill Thought; it always comes alive again.

See! it has been hanged on every gibbet, it has been nailed to every pillory; it has lighted up all the gibbets with its rays, it has illuminated all the pillars with the fire of its haloes.

It has been decapitated, burned, tortured, crucified! Within walls, very similar to ours, magistrates clad in the same purple and capped with headgear like the Attorney Generals have crushed it beneath similar social thunderbolts, in similar murderous periods, in similar inflections of voice, timed by similar see-saw gestures; for, in the midst of evolutions, revolutions, cataclysms, when all things change and when all things crush together, in movable human justice, everlasting victory over the eve and always vanquished on the morrow, keeps the same pose and the same physiognomy!

—JEAN GRAVES

THE AGITATOR

He is quite peculiar, that is to say

He does not chase the gold as kids a fire,
Sees nothing in pomp and pelf to admire;
Unbesmeared by idle praises goes his way,
He does not grab for everything in sight

And really thinks that life was meant for all
And will not help the strong destroy the small,
But when the truth demands it, he can fight.

The hounds that feed upon established rule

Lay bare their fangs and snap when he goes by,
See red and sense that their vile breed must die,
Should the exploited mass join with his school.

At every move and turn they growl and bite
For like their kindred wolves, they fear the light.

JACK GREENBERG

superior will and command. Then a rebel or a novator is always guilty before the law made for conservation. This is why each new idea, religion, regime, truth, has been compelled to smash by violence the resisting violence of the pre-established and resisting ideas, religion or regime.

"Better Government" or Cooperatives?

I cannot share your confidence in "better government", because I do not believe in the government, any of them, since to me they can only differ in names from one another, and because we have witnessed the utterly failure of both the social democratic governments in Germany and the bolshewiki government in Russia... But I wholly share of your confidence in Co-operatives, and what is more, in real co-operatives, free initiative, both individual and collective. Mutual aid and co-operation and co-operatives shall be the very base of a completely new social system, or else, nothing is accomplished.

The Anarchist

The anarchist go ahead and says; All what is help to me without hurt to others is good; all what help the others without hurting me is good also, all the rest is evil. We look for his liberty in the liberty of all; for his happiness in the happiness of all, for his welfare in the universal welfare.

The communists want power, and this explains all; the ruin of the revolution.

Freedom is, for each and all the things of the universe, to follow their natural tendencies—and to fulfill their own virtues, qualities and capacities.

Nature and Mankind

I look many times at the beautiful flower, butterflies, buds, leaves and birds with a great ecstatic pleasure. The contemplation of the Nature's beauties, the meditation upon Nature's wonders and mysteries—from them I drink the highest joys of life... The dearest manifestation of Nature to me is mankind with his miseries and proudness, his glories and his shames, his smallness and his grandeur. So you may understand what human

◆ And so the flood from a River stopped Japan more deadly than the flood of protests coming from all the people in sympathy with China's plight...

◆ Don't take too serious the Pope's protest to Franco on his bombing of women and children in Spain. The old dear will send him his blessings as soon as he can sell him a few bottles of holy water...

◆ The biggest joke of the year is Japan's protesting to France on her seizure of a little isle.

On second thought though, it's not much of a joke when such injustice is committed on a peace-loving, non-aggressive nation like Japan...

◆ The people of the U. S. roared welcome to a fellow named Hughes on his feet to fly around the world at record-breaking speed.

We join in the applause. A man these days who flies several thousand miles without dropping a single bomb on little children deserves to be acclaimed as a great hero.

◆ How times change. Even judges are beginning to accept the soap-box ideas of the "reds". Here is a judge in New Jersey coming out with an open declaration that under our Constitution property rights come before human rights.

◆ Some people bemoan very much the fact that Insull died a poor man. What a difference it would have made to him had he died rich is beyond our philosophic mind...

◆ While King George was feted with great pomp and ceremony in France, his ministers were huddled together with foreign diplomats in veiled secrecy.

We don't give a hang about their secrets, but why do they have to talk behind his back? Can't they have some respect at least for a king?

But then again, maybe he is the kind of a King we once saw in a pinocchio game...

Even though you be a king,
It don't mean a thing
If you ain't got that swing...

◆ And while we were mentioning diplomats, our Santa expresses an opinion that a diplomat is compared to a stripper; she shows everything she has but what the public wants to see...

◆ In one of our philosophic musings that overtakes us once in a while, we sat back wondering if the world was ever created without politicians. Take for example a little thing like wanting to help the refugees who suffer from

On The Block

Nazi persecution. Is it necessary to call a conference of politicians for that? If we were even one half of a president, all we'd do is open our door for them—and that's all there is to it...

Santa-Panta

INTER-NOS

The reader will find a letter enclosed with this issue that ought to become the concern of every one who desires to see MAN! grow and appear regularly.

All we can but add to the letter is this frank statement: we are no longer in a position to borrow funds to cover the standing deficit for the next issue, and, unless sufficient funds reach us to wipe out the deficit, we will have to omit the September issue.

Your action will prevent the breaking up of the regular monthly appearance of MAN! since its being published in Los Angeles.

MAN!

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

INCOME: Los Angeles Group—\$23.35; Gruppo II Libera, Chicago—\$8.00; New Eagle, Pa. (Share of Picnic)—\$4.42; Radical Library, Phila.—\$2.00; Revolutionary Youth Federation, London, Eng.—\$.50; Five Dollars: Sam, George and Paul, John Collins; Cultural Club, Ohio—\$4.00; Three Dollars: O. Bianchi; E. Michaels, London, Eng., (Newspaper sale)—\$2.45; J. W. Fleming—\$2.45; Two Dollars: Ramengo, Frank Erkelens, C. Carbone, Celia Goldberg (Newspaper sale), V. Valero; Newspaper sale, San Francisco,—\$1.32; One Dollar: M. Decoster; Charles E. Johnson, Atteo Bruzio, J. Porcelli, Peppino, Flandro, Gingevi, Masini, Bologna, Masha Grishkan, Charles Myers, T. Tranovich, Michael De Simone; Fifty Cents: Zanette, Zabo, Reali, Memo, Piconi, Fred Bersanti, K. Semeno, S. W., L. Zabow; L. A. Newspaper sale—\$.40, Gentilin—.25. TOTAL \$96.39.

TOTAL EXPENDITURES \$112.60

TOTAL INCOME 96.39

DEFICIT 16.21

DEFICIT FROM LAST ISSUE 80.19

DEFICIT \$96.40